

**REMARKS**

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 16 in connection with the above-identified patent application. Applicant herein addresses each of the rejections posed by the examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 6-9 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by the inventor's prior patent Krent '919.

Claims 5 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Krent in view of B. F. Brasch and in view of Boucher et al.

The applicant is quite familiar with the applied reference, Krent, and provided a detailed discussion of this reference in the Background section of the above-identified patent application. In formulating the claims, applicant has attempted to define structures that patentably distinguish over its previous design. Most significantly, each runner of the claimed novel sled is defined by runners with double opposing convex edges that enhance steerability and provide a highly desirable function to the sled. Such opposing convex runner edges and claimed by applicant and as taken within the particular definition of such as provided by the specification (see page 9, lines 23-onward) are not taught or suggested in Krent. The examiner references Fig. 3 and col. 2, lines 38-40 as somehow suggesting a convex shape. However, this passage only references T-shaped steel runners (16) to "enhance speed and durability." There is no suggestion of a convex structure as claimed by applicant. Indeed each runner edge 602, 604 is round and curved outward.

It is well settled law that the applicant may act as his or her own lexicographer in a patent application. In this case, the specification and drawing of the application (see for example Fig. 3 (items 602 and 604) define the nature of the convex geometry. This language in no way improperly contradicts a standard definition, including that provided by the examiner.

Nevertheless applicant has now further clarified the orientation of the convex edges by amending claim 1 to include reference to the edges opposing on each respective runner in a *widthwise* direction. The distinguishes from orientations along the previously recited lengthwise direction. For a claim to be properly anticipated under Section 102, it the cited reference must teach every element of that claim. Here the recitation of opposing widthwise separated convex edges on each respective runner, having a wider widthwise spacing apart between each of the opposing convex edges in a central lengthwise region than the widthwise spacing apart at the leading end and the trailing end is nowhere contemplated in Krent. Claim 1 should now be allowable.

Dependent claims 2-13 should be allowable as dependent upon non-allowable claim 1.

Independent claim 14 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of Krent. This claim has been amended in accordance with applicant's description at page 6, lines 19-27 to define, in essence, the gap G that allows the web to flex in both a yaw and roll axis. Krent does not define nor does it contemplate such a gap and the large disc-like shield 13 is adapted to allow essentially only yaw flexure.

Accordingly, because Krent lacks the teaching or suggestion of a sufficient gap or web-length/geometry, claim 14 should be allowable thereover. Again, dependent claims 15-19, as depending upon a now-allowable base claim, should also be allowable.

Other references applied and of-record have been reviewed and are not believed to either anticipate or render obvious any of the claims, taken either alone or in combination.

The application is now in condition for allowance with each of the examiner's rejections being either addressed or traversed. Applicant therefore respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date.

Applicant earnestly solicits the examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone to advance the prosecution in any respect.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



William A. Loginov  
Reg. No. 34,863  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500